

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTIAN DAVID ENTO,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant.

1:22-cv-01587-GSA-PC

**ORDER TRANSFERRING CASE TO
SACRAMENTO DIVISION OF EASTERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Christian David Ento (“Plaintiff”), in the custody of the Sacramento County Jail and appearing *pro se*, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the State of California.

It appears that any incidents alleged in the complaint would have taken place in Sacramento which is in Sacramento County; therefore, this action would properly be filed in the Sacramento Division of the Eastern District of California. Pursuant to Local Rule 120(f), a civil action which has not been commenced in the proper court may, on the Court’s own motion, be transferred to the proper court. Therefore, this action will be transferred to the Sacramento Division of the Eastern District of California.

1 This court has granted Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*; however, the
2 transferee court is advised that Plaintiff may be precluded from proceeding without prepayment
3 of fees in this action by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).¹

4 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. This action is transferred to the Sacramento Division of the United States District
6 Court for the Eastern District of California; and
- 7 2. All future filings shall refer to the new Sacramento case number assigned and
8 shall be filed at:

9 United States District Court
10 Eastern District of California
11 501 "I" Street, Suite 4-200
12 Sacramento, CA 95814

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: September 15, 2023

15 /s/ Gary S. Austin
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ¹ See Ento v. People of State of California, 2:13-cv-02271-KJN (dismissed April 15, 2014
27 as seeking to circumvent state court by challenging conviction in federal court (see Order dated March 3,
28 2014)); Ento v. People of States of California, 2:13-cv-2248-AC (dismissed July 10, 2014 for violation
of Rule 8); Ento v. Sacramento County, no 2:13-cv-02107-KJN (dismissed May 25, 2014 for failure to
state a claim); Ento v. City of Sacramento, no. 2:11-cv03747-UA-FFM (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed May 12,
2011 for failure to state a claim)